HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 29 Saturday, July 21, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Soft on Communism: Averell Harriman, whom Harry Truman and friends are building up to stop Stevenson at the convention, has somehow managed to build himself up as the statesman who was never, never "soft on Communism." This phenomenon came forcibly to the attention of the nation's capital in the past week during Averell's visit here and his speech making at the National Press Club.

The Harriman visit to Washington was to a certain extent treated humorously, with the National Press Club wit, Frank Holeman, introducing Harriman to the luncheon meeting held for the latter. Holeman said: "It's not every day you can come in for a $1.75 lunch and see $50 million on the hoof."

However, in quite a serious vein, members of the press and other observers were inspired to check on Averell's claim that he was never "soft on Communism." The record, as scrutinized by some, reads as follows:

(1) In 1942, when Roosevelt and Churchill promised to help Soviet Russia, then invaded by Hitler, the U.S. chose Lend-Lease as its method of assistance. That was the time — indeed it provided the opportunity — when our leaders were in a favorable position to demand a *quid pro quo* from Stalin for the arms which we were preparing to send him. Harriman was a member of the first Lend-Lease mission to Moscow. What attitude did he take? Averell with rash generosity announced our policy as "to give and give, with no expectation of return, with no thought of a *quid pro quo*" (in Harriman's own words). A few months later he followed up in a speech saying: "our task is clear — maximum effort at all sacrifice to give them in every way quick and increased material aid, and also continued assurance that their faith in us is well founded."

Scarcely, "hard on Communism." But, it is claimed, Averell acquired wisdom in dealing with the Muscovites as time wore on, particularly after he became Ambassador to the USSR in 1943. Did he? The record shows that Harriman was in on the negotiations between Stalin and Harry Hopkins in May and June 1945, when the latter went to Moscow to try to settle the Polish (as well as other) questions at issue. The record, as it appears in *Roosevelt and Hopkins: An Intimate History*, by Robert Sherwood, one of FDR's braintrusters, describes these parleys (p. 907, ff.) which took place two months after the Yalta conference. At the latter meeting, Stalin, FDR and Churchill had pledged free elections for Poland.

Sherwood relates how the American representatives (Hopkins, Harriman and Bohlen) agreed to appease Stalin in the formation of a jerry-built Polish provisional government, containing Communists in it, and so constructed that the latter were placed in excellent shape to gradually take over power, and to hold their own kind of free elections — all of which happened in due course. But the point — it is emphasized — is that Ambassador Averell Harriman participated in the sell out of Poland's sovereignty. If he had any suspicion that the deal was "soft on Communism," he certainly did not make the welkin ring with complaints.

What Price Nixon? The anti-Nixonites within the Republican party apparently are of the never-say-die school. Their most recent pitch is the Sherman Adams boomlet, which thus far has failed to get off the ground despite the valiant efforts of certain elements of the GOP's liberal wing, and perhaps because of its exposure by HUMAN EVENTS ("Operation X," June 23) which apparently set off the commentating of the commentators on this matter.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the face of flat assertions by Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard Hall and Presidential news secretary James Hagerty that the GOP ticket will be Eisenhower and Nixon, Dorothy Thompson this week in her widely-read column says she fails to understands why the GOP does not nominate Adams for the Vice-Presidency.

She ascribes to him all the attributes necessary for the office, and for that of the Presidency. But she overlooks the fact that probably no Executive branch official in the Eisenhower Administration has irked and riled as many members of the House and Senate as has Adams.

Next day the *New York Times*' equally well-known columnist, Arthur Krock, who enjoys extremely close relations with the White House, provided the answers to Miss Thompson's wonderings. In essence, he says Nixon is the overwhelming favorite of "the Republican state organizations which have the responsibility of winning elections"; that refusal to renominate him at this point would have an extremely bad divisive effect on the entire Republican party; and that, without Nixon, the GOP will have infinitely tougher sledding in the pivotal state of California.

Nixon's friends meanwhile express satisfaction over final figures just released on the primary voting in Oregon two months ago. They show that President Eisenhower, the only Presidential aspirant listed on the Republican side, received 213,418 votes; and that, in the Vice-Presidential blank on the GOP side, 78,522 voters took the time and trouble to write in Nixon's name. For a write-in, the one out of three ratio is regarded as extremely high.

Former New York Governor Thomas E. Dewey received 2,399 write-in votes for the Vice-Presidential nomination; Chief Justice Earl Warren, 1,230, and former Colorado Governor Dan Thornton, who appeared briefly in the state, 1,024.

Not Merely Gossip: It is not widely known, but it is a fact — confirmed by reliable sources — that the White House is seriously considering the appointment of George Ives, son of Senator Ives (R., N.Y.), to fill the seat on the National Labor Relations Board which will be left vacant on August 28, when the term of incumbent Ivar Peterson expires. Young Ives has been for some years the Administrative Assistant to his father, the Senator, and is credited with the same affectionate sentiments towards the labor bosses as his father, one of the outstanding of the "liberal" bloc of Senators.

The Senator votes pro-labor and constantly seeks to cultivate the good will of labor union officials — although in his last appeal to the electorate, to elect him Governor of New York in 1954, Ives apparently failed to get union support. Ives and son are also reportedly very friendly with Secretary of Labor Mitchell, exponent — in the Administration — of the policy of "let's play ball with the labor leaders." Mitchell is a highly vocal adversary of the right-to-work laws. Mitchell is reportedly pushing the appointment of young Ives to NLRB. If such a choice is made, it will not be welcome news to the right wing of the GOP and to Senator Goldwater, courageous critic of labor union abuses.

● Congressional investigators, rummaging through the pages of the *Diary* of Henry Morgenthau, former Secretary of the Treasury, have reportedly come upon some interesting information about the behind-the-scenes conflict over the famous Morgenthau Plan to de-industrialize postwar Germany. The information unearthed will greatly rebound to the credit of Ambassador "Jimmy" Riddleberger (whose brusque treatment of Soviet leader Khrushchev last year won applause). Riddleberger, according to the Morgenthau notes, drafted a plan to re-industrialize postwar Germany and sold the idea to President Truman in 1945. The notes go on to show that Morgenthau did not like this news when he heard it, nor did his assistant secretary Harry D. White, whom Attorney General Brownell has labelled a Soviet agent. White and Morgenthau flew to Europe to the Headquarters of the Allied Command, then under General Eisenhower. They succeeded in getting SHAEF to send a counterproposal to Washington, arguing against reviving German industry and in favor of razing German factories.

Hoffman: Selection of Paul G. Hoffman, Board Chairman of the notorious Fund for the Republic, to be a member of the U.S. delegation to the Novem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber General Assembly meeting, did nothing to convince anyone that the Administration is sincerely prepared to take all possible steps to prevent seating of Red China.

Hoffman publicly proclaims his opposition to any such move and his ardent anti-Communism on all counts. But despite the unanimous approval of his nomination by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, his many critics continue to feel that the blatant anti-anti-Communism of the Fund, under his direction, is more indicative of his true beliefs than are his public protestations.

Several Senators who had contemplated fighting his nomination finally remained quiet only because they felt that, in view of strong White House pressure in his behalf, such a battle would be a lost cause and they preferred to hold their fire for an issue on which they might have a chance of winning.

Red China: A fatalistic pessimism is settling over many Washington quarters concerning what looks like a distinct possibility that one of the first things the United Nations General Assembly will do when it meets in November, one week after our general elections, will be to seat Communist China. The belief gains wider and wider acceptance that the skids already have been greased, that the United States can do nothing to prevent it.

But the Senate is doing its valiant best to put itself firmly on record as opposing any such move. Columnist David Lawrence brought out this week that the State Department appropriation bill signed by the President on June 20 contained this clause originated by the Senate Appropriations Committee: "It is the sense of Congress that the Communist China government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China."

Why no publicity was given to the rider at the time of its adoption is a complete mystery.

This week, the Senate Committee wrote into the Foreign Aid Appropriation a similar clause, this one saying Congress "hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime." It went further this time, however, by adding another proviso saying that should the Communists nevertheless be seated in the UN, the President should consult with Congress on "the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States." And on July 18, Representative Edna F. Kelly (D., N.Y.) introduced a resolution which was passed by a vote of 371 to 0. The measure expressed the sense of Congress that admission of Red China to the UN "would gravely injure the UN and impair its effective functioning."

The implication of the Kelly resolution and the two riders, of course, is that if Peiping gets into the UN, Congress may take the U.S. out.

Some observers interpret the action as a slap at the Administration, in view of widely-bruited reports that it plans to have American delegates to the November meeting speak loudly against admission of Peiping but that that will be the extent of the opposition.

The Senate Committee's additional rider preventing use of any Mutual Security funds for the Aswan Dam project in Egypt without Committee approval, is interpreted as another slap at the Administration, inasmuch as Secretary of State Dulles has given firm verbal assurances that he does not plan any such move. The Committee apparently wants to be sure he does not change his mind.

Letter from PROFESSOR QUINTUS C. WILSON, Chairman, Dept. of Journalism, University of Utah: "Please thank the friend of the University of Utah who was good enough to provide a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS for the Department of Journalism. We have found during the past year that not only Journalism students but Political Science students have been using the file of HUMAN EVENTS in the Journalism Department library."

Sewers And Subsidies: A bill lies before Congress, after quietly winning a vote from careless members of the House, which opens another gate to irresponsible spending, according to many observers. It also, as the Richmond *News-Leader* remarks, is "so violently damaging to sound constitutional government that it should have been page one news across the country." Sentiment is rising, as the implications are getting around Capitol Hill, and the national legislature may well, if prodded, reject the measure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The bill is entitled the Water Pollution Control Act. Under section 6 of the bill, Federal aid would be given directly to selected municipal governments for the construction of sewerage systems and sewage disposal plants. Presently, the bill authorizes $50 million a year for 10 years, but most observers expect that this is just a starter.

The constitutional aspect attracts comment. Congress should have no powers except those delegated to it by the Constitution. Legal experts say that the measure contains only the vaguest reference to some Federal "jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation." The *News-Leader* editorially finds no "clear Constitutional justification" and calls it "flagrantly unconstitutional."

The bill is highly unfair, a point which Representative Howard Smith (D., Va.) underscores: "The bill authorizes one-half billion dollars at the rate of $50 million a year to be distributed among cities that have not cleaned up their pollution. Under the formula, a city that has done its duty and has cleaned up and gone to all the expense and done the work or provided for doing the work does not get a nickel out of the bill." Conversely, Representative Smith goes on to say, a city that has not taken care of its water pollution problem gets paid for its negligence; while the residents of cities that have shouldered the expense of such duties are penalized because they have to pay their proportion of the Federal taxes that go into this project. "That," sums up Congressman Smith, "seems to me totally inequitable."

And that unfairness, other members point out, promotes more negligence. Last year, it is claimed, 280 municipal treatment plants were built. The $50 million proposed for this bill, would have benefited only two-thirds of these cities. Does anyone — it is asked — imagine that the other one-third would have gone ahead anyhow, entirely at their own expense? Obviously, they would have delayed their construction plans until, or in the hope that, Federal funds would become available.

Clouds Over Israel: *Violent Truce* ($3.50 — Devin-Adair, 23 East 26th Street, New York 10, N.Y.) is the report of Commander E. H. Hutchison, USNR, of the Arab-Israeli conflict — 1951-1955. Commander Hutchison was a neutral American officer. Three other military observers, a Dane and two Americans, eyewitnesses to the border clashes, corroborate the finding of Commander Hutchison in their forewords to this much-needed book.

An officer of the U.S. Navy since 1942 who served with distinction in the Pacific theater in World War II, Commander Hutchison was assigned to the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization as a military observer on October 1, 1951. A year later he became head of the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission (MAC), composed of Israelis, Jordanians, and military observers from six neutral nations.

During Commander Hutchison's chairmanship, Arab-Israeli tension reached its height. Hundreds of incidents occurred, including the Israeli destruction of the village of Kibya, in which 53 Arabs were massacred, and the controversial Scorpion Pass bus incident, in which 11 Israelis lost their lives. When Commander Hutchison could find no evidence of Jordanian guilt in this incident, the Israelis withdrew from the Commission. But a UN investigation was conducted, and Commander Hutchison's verdict was sustained.

Violent Truce is written with candor and with fidelity to the facts of the conflict as Commander Hutchison witnessed it. His account is taken straight from the record and adds a frightening new dimension to our understanding of Middle Eastern strife. The author takes note of Soviet maneuvering in that area and offers specific recommendations toward a solution that will best serve American interests and avert full-scale war.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and change of address. 1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold. The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 29 HUMAN EVENTS July 21, 1956

Article Section

TARIFF DILEMMA:

International Welfare or American Jobs?

By RUSSELL TURNER

ONE OF THE stranger phenomena of the mid-1950's American political scene is the total eclipse of traditional major party differences over tariff and international trade policies.

No longer is it, as it was only 25 or 20 or fewer years ago, a battle between Free Trade Democrats and Protectionist Republicans.

Today, it is Free Trade internationalists in both parties waging defensive battle against fast-growing blocs, also in both parties, which seek to prevent extinction of numerous American industries and thousands of American jobs; blocs which include many former Free Traders whose views have changed as they have seen their own businesses fade under the onslaught of recently-mushrooming imports.

The mid-50's controversy actually boils down to a question of degree. There is little quarrel over the need for some form of assistance to war-ravaged nations still seeking to regain economic independence, to underdeveloped countries seeking to advance their economies to a self-sufficient state. Generally conceded is the need for some such aid to help persuade peoples of those countries that their own welfare demands rejection of insiduous blandishments and tempting lures dangled by international Communism.

But the question of degree arises when, as a result of direct financial aid given those countries and markets opened up by reduction of our tariff rates, we see products made in those countries taking over American markets; and American producers of competing goods, unable to cut prices because of high labor and raw materials costs, are forced to curtail or close down operations.

Do we then clamp down on those imports by reraising tariffs, by quotas, or by other devices? No, say internationalists; that would compel the other countries to look elsewhere for markets, perhaps to the Communist world, and we would have lost another round in the continuing global battle against Red tyranny. To American workers thrown out of jobs, they simply say, sorry, we hope you find another job; to investors losing their capital, sorry, but you are the victims of a world-wide struggle to prevent even our own America from being ultimately enslaved by Communism.

But there is a growing element which says no, that is carrying it too far; that is carrying international good will to the extreme of lowering our own standards of living to levels prevailing in the countries we are trying to help. Our efforts, they say, should be to raise the living standards of other countries, but at the same time to maintain or even to improve our own.

They also offer statistics seeming to bear out their argument that GATT and the trade agreements program generally are strictly a one-way street; that while they have led to major increases in our imports, our exports to other countries have remained at about the same level. If exports were rising along with imports, they say, the program would be much more justifiable.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The issue will be a subject of serious conflict during Platform Committee deliberations at both national conventions. Internationalists presently are in control of both major parties; but in both, there will be substantial demands for some toning down of presently ascendant Free Trade policies.

Within the Democratic party, for instance, the South traditionally has been solidly behind Free Trade in order to promote foreign markets for its cotton. Now, however, the South finds its cotton markets drying up, both at home and abroad; at home, because the textile industry has been placed in dire straits as a result of flooding imports from Japan and other countries where labor costs are a fraction of what they are here; abroad, because so many countries, largely as a result of postwar American economic and technical aid, have substantially boosted their own cotton production. Southern delegates to the Democratic National Convention will be far less enthusiastic for a strong Free Trade plank than they have been in the past; many, in fact, will be urging action to curb textile imports.

Many labor unions which long have supported Democratic low tariff policies, but which now see members' jobs evaporating because of import competition, suddenly find their faith in Free Trade shaken severely, to the point where they now are demanding immediate steps to halt influxes of goods manufactured abroad. The story they present to the Democratic Convention Platform Committee will be totally dissimilar from what it has been in the past.

But if these protesting elements do win some sort of compromise plank seeking protection for individual industries, it will be only after a bitter fight. The Democratic party nationally still is controlled by ultra-liberals, *a la* Americans for Democratic Action and the three front-running candidates for the party's Presidential nomination; all are also of the ultra-internationalist school which would promote Free Trade even at the expense of American industry and living standards.

THE BATTLE will be no less bitter when Republicans gather in San Francisco to decide on a platform on which the GOP will appeal for votes this fall.

The Eisenhower Administration has taken over *in toto* the trade agreements program which the late President Roosevelt inaugurated as part of the early-30's New Deal, and which the Truman Administration incorporated into the postwar General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade — the deeply controversial GATT.

As a matter of fact, this Administration has gone even further by negotiating internationally, and then trying unsuccessfully to win Congressional approval of, the equally controversial Organization for Trade Cooperation — OTC. It is, in effect, a rewrite of the unlamented International Trade Organization (ITO) which the Truman Administration first agreed to but then dropped, like the proverbial hot potato, when a sudden crescendo of Congressional protest bespoke preponderant voter opposition.

But even though this Administration is firmly behind GATT and OTC, it has been unable to carry along with it a substantial, perhaps a majority, segment of its own party. It was due primarily to GOP opposition, in fact, that the OTC authorizing bill was allowed to rest quietly in a House Rules Committee pigeonhole until the passage of time effected its peaceful demise.

Probably no more outspoken critics of the Eisenhower trade program are to be found than Representative Richard Simpson of Pennsylvania, who doubles as Chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, and GOP Senator George Malone of Nevada; and their intra-party following is not small.

Ironically, one of the most carefully prepared and most effective expositions of the arguments advanced by the Simpson-Malone school in support of tariff protection for selected American industries, is a study made by nothing less than the Research Division of the Republican

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Committee. It was issued in September, 1952, just as that year's Presidential campaign was waxing warm; the Committee undoubtedly wishes now that it never had been prepared.

Many blunt truths set forth in this 1952 study will be raised to haunt the 1956 Convention's Platform Committee in its efforts to draft a trade plank embodying the Administration program but without completely disavowing past GOP policy.

For instance, from the Study's Foreword:

"Goods shipped to our shores from countries which have few if any laws regarding cartels, monopolies, working conditions, insurance, minimum wages and numerous costly features which are mandatory in the United States compete directly with the products of our own workmen. . . . If imported goods can undersell domestic goods because of low production costs resulting from low wages, monopolies, lack of workman's compensation insurance, etc., then the American worker is entitled as a matter of Constitutional right to some form of import regulation that will put him on an equal footing."

Tough to contradict. Or this:

"We might say to our farmers, factory workers, and businessmen, 'reduce your income and living standards to those of the coolie or peon or get out of the kinds of industry that cannot compete with the foreign industries using that kind of labor.' Indeed, there have been open and serious attempts by 'Fair Deal' leaders to do that very thing."

Today, four years later, critics say there have been open and serious attempts to do that very thing by the Eisenhower Administration.

There is little doubt but that the Administration will seek to persuade the San Francisco convention to adopt a plank calling for American participation in OTC. Four years ago, the GOP Study had this to say of OTC's predecessor, the ITO:

"The free trade banner has been waved more and more openly with each year of the operation of the trade agreements program. . . . (ITO) was to be a major step toward economic one-worldism and so entangling that our whole free enterprise system was threatened. It was decided that it might be too big a pill for Congress to swallow all at once, and the initial step became a multilateral trade agreement known as GATT.

"This GATT, in effect provisionally since 1947, is a sort of nebulous, hydra-headed arrangement whereby a number of countries have agreed to put concessions in the pot all under one agreement. . . . When legislation has been adopted that might even remotely appear to be an affirmation or recognition of the legality of GATT, Republican leaders have been successful in attaching a caveat which states that under no circumstances should the adoption of the bill in question be deemed a ratification of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"These same alert leaders have repeatedly challenged the (Truman) Administration to bring GATT before Congress for ratification or rejection. Each time its sponsors have refused to put it to the test. . . .

"The ITO, for which GATT was to be merely a stepping stone, was as bad a proposal as some of the plans for a one-world government. . . . It would have been a 'Charter for World Prosperity' (as claimed by Truman-Acheson State Department propaganda) only because it would have tended to level world living standards — and that level would have been far below those now prevailing in the United States."

Substitute OTC for ITO, say critics, and the document becomes as valid an argument against Eisenhower Administration trade policy as it was four years ago against Truman Administration policy. Its allegations are exactly those currently advanced by both Republican and Democratic opponents of OTC and the Eisenhower program.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Republicans in Congress and on the home front," says the GOP Research Study, "must keep a constant vigil to prevent the one-worlders and free traders from doing stealthily what the American public would not let them do openly."

Replace the first word of that sentence, opine advocates of some protection for domestic industries, and the words still are as true as they were when originally indited.

Nor has the Eisenhower Administration had any more stomach for presenting GATT for Congressional consideration than did its predecessor. As did the Truman Administration, it stands on the contention that such a multi-nation pact is fully authorized by the basic trade agreements act.

BUT QUESTIONS persist as to the legality of U.S. adherence to GATT without specific Congressional sanction, and even through the four Eisenhower sessions, Congress has affirmatively refused to enact any legislation which might tend to give such sanction; where the question was raised, it has added language disavowing any such intent.

This was one of the two principal points of opposition to the OTC legislation — the assumption all around that if it were passed, it would necessarily be at least tacit Congressional ratification of GATT, since the OTC was presented as simply a means of administering and policing GATT.

The second point of opposition was the contention that in actual practice, the OTC would have far greater potential powers than its advocates care to admit — and that in exercise of those powers, the United States would have only one out of 35 votes.

As examples, opponents note that the OTC might decide, over U.S. opposition, that values of goods moving in international trade should be computed on a basis different from that which this country has been employing, having the effect of reducing tariffs even further; or that it could outlaw quota restrictions used by this country for many years to hold down imports of some agricultural commodities.

It is over-simplification to say that the present controversy is simply the old free trade versus protectionist battle. Many sincere believers in the need for helping other countries to improve their economies, are equally sincere in believing that free trade is being carried too far, to the point of needlessly lowering our own American standards of living.

The issue will be fought over many times in the future, as it has been in the past. Its next big round will be at the national conventions; the degree of free trade advocated by both conclaves probably will be tempered only according to the strength of the protests lodged by those who believe American living standards can and should be maintained at or above their existing levels.

The next round then will be in November; not at the Presidential level, because differences there probably will be slight, but rather in Congressional races. For many years, it has been Congress which has provided the only effective checkrein on internationalism; assuming voters exercise as much vigilance in 1956 as they have in the past, Congress should continue to exercise that rein, inadequate as it may seem at times.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

Russell Turner, a Washington, D. C., newsman for 22 years, is staff assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr., National Radio Commentator. Mr. Turner also serves as Washington correspondent for *Partners*, Chicago monthly magazine covering the field of labor-management relations. His last article appeared in HUMAN EVENTS on July 7 — "Paying Your Neighbor's Rent — The Public Housing Program."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED